IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.ESWARAIAH

WRIT PETITION No. 23292 of 2005

Between:

B.Jagadeeshwara Reddy

..... PETITIONER

AND

Govt of A.P., Rep by its Principal Secretary (Home),

Secretariat, Hyderabad and another

.....RESPONDENTS

ORDER:

Seeking a Mandamus, declaring the action of the respondents in not providing Gunman/Security Cover to the petitioner, by considering the representations of the petitioner dated 03.06.2004 and 08.10.2005, as illegal and arbitrary, the present writ petition is filed.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Home.

It is stated that the petitioner is a practicing Advocate in Tadpatri town since 1994 and he is an active member of the Telugu Desam Party and the District Executive Member of the party. It is further stated that during the last elections, he has canvassed on behalf of Telugu Desam Party actively, and in that aspect, Sri J.C.Prabhakara Reddy, the younger brother of Sri J.C.Diwakar Reddy, Cabinet Minister, bore grudge against him and trying to attack him to scare the opponents. It is also stated that there is political rivalry between the petitioner and J.C.Prabhakara Reddy for the last 7 years, and earlier, he gave requisition to the Superintendent of Police, Anantapur District, Anantapur for providing police escort to him, and accordingly, he filed representations on 03.06.2004 and 08.10.2005, and the then Chief Minister also recommended the concerned to provide police security to the petitioner through his letter dated 06.04.2005. But the respondents have not considered the representations of the petitioner dated 03.06.2004 and 08.10.2005 so far. Hence the petitioner is constrained to file this writ petition.

Admittedly, the petitioner made representations to the respondents on 03.06.2004 and 08.10.2005 seeking police escort, and the then former Chief Minister also recommended the same. But the respondents have not taken any steps in this regard. There is no justification on the part of the respondents, in providing Gunman or security covering the petitioner, protecting his life and liberty.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition, with a direction to the

2nd respondent to consider the representations of the petitioner dated 03.06.2004 and 08.10.2005 and pass appropriate orders thereon, in accordance with law, within a period of one week, from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

With the above observations, the Writ Petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

_____

V.ESWARAIAH,J

Dated: 28.10.2005

Dsr